## Pages 1 - 14

NO. CR 18-00577 CRB

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable Charles R. Breyer, Judge

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

) VS. )

MICHAEL RICHARD LYNCH and STEPHEN KEITH CHAMBERLAIN,

Defendants.

San Francisco, California Wednesday, November 13, 2019

## TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

## **APPEARANCES:**

For Plaintiff:

DAVID L. ANDERSON

United States Attorney 450 Golden Gate Avenue

San Francisco, California 94102

BY: ROBERT S. LEACH

WILLIAM FRENTZEN

ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For Defendant Lynch:

STEPTOE & JOHNSON, LLP

1330 Conneticut Avenue, NW

Washington, D.C. 20036

BY: REID H. WEINGARTEN

ATTORNEY AT LAW

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE)

Reported By: Marla F. Knox, RPR, CRR

Official Reporter

APPEARANCES:	(CONT'D)	
For Defendant	Chamberla	in:
	BY:	BIRD MARELLA BOXER WOLPER NESSIM DROOKS LINCENBERG RHOW 1875 Century Park East Los Angeles, California 90067 GARY S. LINCENBERG ATTORNEY AT LAW

## Wednesday - November 13, 2019 1 1:35 p.m. 2 PROCEEDINGS ---000---3 THE CLERK: Calling Criminal 18-0577, USA versus 4 5 Michael Richard lynch and Stephen Keith Chamberlain. 6 Counsel, please step forward and state your appearances for the record. 7 MR. LEACH: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Robert Leach 8 and William Frentzen from the United States. 9 MR. WEINGARTEN: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Reid 10 11 Weingarten for Michael Lynch. MR. LINCENBERG: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Gary 12 13 Lincenberg for Mr. Chamberlain whose presence is waived. MR. WEINGARTEN: And Mr. Lynch is in England in the 14 15 middle of his civil trial. THE COURT: The middle? 16 17 MR. WEINGARTEN: Not the middle. THE COURT: The middle of the trial that was supposed 18 to have ended in July, the middle? 19 20 MR. WEINGARTEN: No, I misspoke. In fact, it has gone 21 on for over 80 days. There have been 36 fact witnesses. The evidence is either complete or almost complete. 22 23 Lynch himself testified. He was cross-examined for over 20 days. It was reported in the English Legal Press that no 24 25 one in the history of the United Kingdom has ever been on the

stand longer.

Right now the attorneys are preparing their closing submissions to the Court. They are expected to be over a thousand pages. And end of December, beginning of January are closing arguments; and the trial is expected to end officially around January 15th.

So when I said "middle," I was speaking loosely. I just gave you the facts.

**THE COURT:** No. That's quite a record.

MR. WEINGARTEN: Yes.

THE COURT: Well.

MR. LEACH: Your Honor, my office, the Northern

District of California, executed its extradition request on or about September 10th of this year.

DOJ's Office of International Affairs has submitted the extradition request to the State Department for presentation to the United Kingdom. I believe that happened later in September.

My understanding is that the State Department has yet to formally submit the extradition request to the United Kingdom. Through our Office of International Affairs, we continue to attempt to expedite that as much as we can in light of other extradition requests that the office is handling, but I expect that to happen soon. And that's where we are from the DOJ's perspective.

THE COURT: 1 Okay. MR. WEINGARTEN: That's all news to me. So from our 2 perspective, we haven't heard word one. 3 Obviously the Court recalls our understanding many, many, 4 5 many months ago that we would sit tight and see what 6 specifically is presented in the United Kingdom and then make a 7 decision fully cognizant of all the rights we have under the Treaty. So that has not yet happened. So apparently they are 8 under way. I hadn't known any of that. 9 THE COURT: What is taking the State Department so 10 11 long? I can't speak to that, Your Honor. 12 MR. LEACH: 13 THE COURT: Well, can you ask? I asked many times, Your Honor. 14 MR. LEACH: Ι 15 understand --16 THE COURT: Can they please -- can you get them to 17 file a declaration with this Court as to why -- as to how they 18 proceeded and whether they are going to -- what their 19 anticipated dates are or what their course of action is? 20 I would just like some explanation. I have a co-Defendant 21 who is awaiting trial. The case is old. And I think properly the Defense has said: Look, you know, we are in trial now. 22 Ιf 23 the United States wants us, we will respond when served with

MR. WEINGARTEN: Yes.

24

25

process.

That's their position. Every Defendant is 1 THE COURT: entitled to that. But I need to know from the State Department 2 because I don't think I should just leave this out there to --3 in, you know, no man's land. 4 5 Please tell them the Court wants a statement from the State Department as to their intentions and dates as to how 6 7 they are proceeding with the extradition. And please file that with copy to Counsel by December 1st. 8 MR. LEACH: I will do that, Your Honor. 9 Okay. Now, that takes care of that. 10 THE COURT: 11 Mr. Lincenberg? MR. LINCENBERG: We have a motion on calendar before 12 the Court for clarification --13 THE COURT: I read it. 14 15 MR. LINCENBERG: -- on bond. 16 THE COURT: It seems to me I don't really have jurisdiction over this. 17 MR. LINCENBERG: I get it. I think there is one thing 18 19 the Court can do. 20 I understand that courts are frustrated. They can't really take on CBP. The history of this is I think that the 21 U.S. Attorney's Office and FBI have exercised extreme 22 23 good-faith whenever we have attempted to have arranged for travel, and we have run into obstacles where on one occasion it 24

was that an agent had to get something from the Consulate in

25

London and meet my client at the airport because he had to be on a plane to get here.

So what we are seeking to do is have some clarification from the Court, which C -- you know, the border people can ignore; but if the Court makes a statement at least that as part of bail, the -- they are allowing my client into this country under this 8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5) because it is of significant public benefit.

I think it is appropriate for the Court to also clarify that the Court believes that significant public benefit means helping to expedite the travel and not limit my client from being able to work here. For example --

THE COURT: I don't know that that's true. I mean, I think I can say -- if you want me to say something, I can say nothing in the Court's bail order prevents the Defendant from traveling to the United States for any purpose.

I can't say he can come here for business purposes; that is, a Court orders that he be here -- that he is allowed in for business purposes. I don't have jurisdiction to do that. You know, that would be up on appeal; and I would -- number one, I wouldn't do it. If I did it, I would be reversed, in my opinion, because I can't order -- I can do a lot of things as a federal judge. I can't order somebody to come to the United States for business purposes.

I can order them to be here for these proceedings but as

you point out, that's not a problem. They will let him in for these proceedings.

However, if you want to give the negative of it, if you think it would be useful, I can say just what I just said, so that it's not construed that that's the only reason he can come to the United States. But it is clearly up to the Government to decide whether or not he should be admitted for any other purpose. I can't get involved in that.

MR. LINCENBERG: So I --

THE COURT: And I wouldn't.

MR. LINCENBERG: So everything that the Court has just said I think is fair enough. I think it might be of some benefit.

I would ask that the Court say something a little bit further, which is that when my client is in the United States, it is a perfectly legitimate purpose for him to be also working. It is consistent with the Court's bail order.

Other Defendants -- even Mr. Hussain, you know, works when he is in the United States. Many other Defendants work when they are in the United States. And I don't think that the Government opposes that or necessarily disagrees.

They are running into some red tape. And the Court can't dictate here how the border folks are going to interpret the red tape; but if there is a clear statement from the Court that the Court believes it is perfectly appropriate for

Mr. Chamberlain when he is over here for court meetings with

Counsel --

THE COURT: Counsel, I don't know whether that is true. It depends on what the business is he is going to be engaged in. I don't know. I don't know whether it is true or whether it is not true. And that's not for the court -- listen, I don't for a moment think you are not asking this in good-faith and for the sole purpose of facilitating his entry to the United States. I accept that because I know you are and I accept that -- that request.

Nevertheless, the lines are fairly clear in the Court's mind as to what I can do and what I can't do.

And I'm not going to interpret my bail order to say now he has permission to do X, Y or Z in the United States. He may or he may not. I don't know.

He may have complete -- be able to do it. But whether he comes in or not is a matter that I can insist on for purposes of the litigation, but I don't think my authority goes any further than that.

So I am just going to make sure that the order doesn't somehow preclude that the Government can't use it -- or the ICE or whoever the agency is -- can't use it as saying: Well, the Judge is limiting him to come to the United States for these proceedings only -- for coming to the United States only for these proceedings. I don't want it to be a limitation, but I

also don't want it to be an invitation to do something else.

MR. LINCENBERG: I think that is helpful, but the

Court can and clearly can go one step further. It is in the

Court's interest for people who are pending trial to be engaged

in lawful business purposes and gainfully employed.

This is a monster of a case. There may be periods of time where my client is here for a lengthy period of time. He shouldn't be expected to give up his job or not work while he is here. And nobody is suggesting otherwise. These folks are not suggesting otherwise.

We are dealing with something where I believe just that a message from the Court, that that is appropriate -- it might help the border folks --

THE COURT: Let me go one step -- let me go half a step further. If you present to the Government and the Probation Department what work you propose your client to be engaged in in the United States, I then will listen to an argument as to whether or not I should expand the bail order to do exactly what you want him to do.

MR. LINCENBERG: Very well. I can do that.

THE COURT: Bring it. Show it to the Government.

MR. LINCENBERG: I can do it right now. I don't think they are going to object. We can do it on the record. This is pretty straightforward. He is --

THE COURT: You can do it any way you want to do it,

```
but my suggestion is that you are much better off sitting
 1
     not -- much better off just talking to them, okay, and then
 2
     figure out whether there can be some language that then can go
 3
     into the order. And I'm telling you I will consider it, okay.
 4
 5
              MR. LINCENBERG: Very well.
              THE COURT:
                          So you -- yeah, you won a little bit.
 6
              MR. LINCENBERG:
                              A little bit.
 7
                                (Laughter)
 8
 9
              THE COURT:
                          Anything else?
              MR. WEINGARTEN:
                               Just I'm reflecting on the dramatic
10
11
     news I just heard. The Government filed this paperwork for
     extradition in September. Obviously we were wondering why
12
     months and months and months have passed.
13
          It would be very relevant for the extradition lawyers in
14
15
     England and for me advising my client to know what indictment
16
     we will face.
17
          Obviously, the superseder profoundly changed the world and
18
     caused us to want to explore what rights we had under the
19
     Extradition Treaty.
20
          So I would like to pose the question to the Prosecutors,
21
     if I may, what charges will we face? Is there another
22
     superseder in place or coming?
23
          (Pause in proceedings)
              THE COURT: Well, they can answer it any way they
24
25
     want.
```

```
MR. WEINGARTEN:
                               I know.
 1
 2
              THE COURT: Any way you want to answer it.
              MR. LEACH:
                          No.
 3
              THE COURT:
                          No what?
 4
 5
              MR. WEINGARTEN: I guess that means -- there is no
 6
     superseder coming.
              MR. LEACH: No, I'm not making a public statement
 7
     about the extradition request before it is delivered through
 8
 9
     the proper channels.
              THE COURT: Well, okay. So the answer is whatever has
10
11
     been in the extradition request --
              MR. LEACH: I mean, there is a public indictment still
12
13
     pending.
              MR. WEINGARTEN: Obviously, we know that.
14
15
              MR. LEACH:
                         They know many of the charges.
                         Obviously what you want to do is know
16
              THE COURT:
17
     whether it has been superseded?
18
              MR. WEINGARTEN:
                               Yes.
                          That is up to the Government to decide
19
              THE COURT:
20
     what they want to say on that subject.
21
              MR. WEINGARTEN:
                               I assume if there is an actual formal
22
     request from the State Department, we are going to see it at
23
     some point so I would like to know now.
                         I have no comment now, Your Honor.
24
              MR. LEACH:
25
              THE COURT:
                          There you go. No comment.
```

```
MR. WEINGARTEN:
                               Can't force them.
 1
                                                   I --
 2
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
              MR. WEINGARTEN:
                              Thank you, Your Honor.
 3
                          Anything further?
              THE COURT:
 4
 5
              MR. LEACH:
                          Oh, Your Honor, I assume we should set
     another date for Mr. Chamberlain, and that the time between now
 6
     and that date should be excluded for effective --
 7
              THE COURT: Yeah. Is it all right, Mr. Lincenberg, if
 8
     we set January or something towards the end of January?
 9
10
              MR. LINCENBERG: I believe Mr. Leach said that he
11
     had -- January was tough for him. We were talking about early
12
     February.
13
              THE COURT: February is fine.
              MR. LEACH: February 13th.
14
15
              THE CLERK:
                         The 12th?
16
              MR. LEACH: The 12th.
17
              THE CLERK:
                         Yes.
              THE COURT:
                          There you go.
18
              MR. LINCENBERG:
                              At 1:30?
19
20
              THE CLERK:
                          Yes.
21
              MR. LEACH: Is it appropriate to exclude time for
     effective preparation and continuity of Counsel, Your Honor?
22
              THE COURT: Yes. So excluded.
23
              MR. LINCENBERG: Thank you, Your Honor.
24
25
              MR. WEINGARTEN: Thank you.
```

1	MR. LEACH: Thank you.
2	THE COURT: Thank you.
3	00
4	
5	
6	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
7	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
8	from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
9	
10	DATE: Thursday, November 14, 2019
11	
12	
13	$\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{V}_{AGV}$
14	Marla Knox
15	Marla F. Knox, RPR, CRR U.S. Court Reporter
16	-
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	